

### **REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request entry of amendments to claims 1 and 29. Please cancel claims 30, 31, and 34, and withdraw claims 2-25, 36, and 37, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, including paragraphs [0021], [0022], [0028], [0069], [0073], [0074], [0082], [0099], [0128], and [0138], and the originally filed claims and, therefore, do not add new matter.

Applicants submit that pending claims 1, 26-29, 32, 33, and 38-47 are in condition for allowance, or are in better condition for presentation on appeal, and respectfully request that the claims as amended be entered.

### **Objections**

Applicants have provided herewith a corrected claim 29, which has been amended in accordance with the suggestion as provided in the Action.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph**

Claims 1, 26, 32-35, 38, 39, and 45-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly lacking written description support. As claim 34 has been canceled, the rejection as applied to this claim is rendered moot.

Applicants traverse the rejection as it might apply to the amended claims, including claims dependent therefrom, for the reasons given below.

The Office Action alleges, in pertinent part, that the specification does not support the element "low complexity." Further, the Action intimates that the order of domains does not meet the standard for adequate written description.

Notwithstanding that the linkers as described meet the definition of "low complexity" as defined by the art, claim 34 has been canceled, so this aspect of the rejection is rendered moot.

Regarding the configuration, while Applicants do not acquiesce to the reasoning offered in the Action, in order to expedite prosecution toward allowance, the claims have been amended

In re Application of:

Woodbury et al.

Application No.: 10/671,995

Filing Date: September 26, 2003

Page 9

PATENT

Attorney Docket No. BIO1100

to recite a configuration that is admitted by the Action to find express support in the specification (see, e.g., p. 10, ll. 5-12).

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

In re Application of:  
Woodbury et al.  
Application No.: 10/671,995  
Filing Date: September 26, 2003  
Page 10


PATENT  
Attorney Docket No. BIO1100

**Conclusion**

Applicants submit that pending claims 1, 26-29, 32, 33, and 38-47 are in condition for allowance, or are in better condition for appeal. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if there are any questions relating to this submission.

No fee is deemed necessary with the filing of this paper. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees required by this submission, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 07-1896 referencing the above-identified docket number. A copy of the Transmittal Sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted



Daryl A. Basham, J.D., Ph.D.  
Registration No. 45,869  
Telephone: (858) 677-1429  
Facsimile: (858) 677-1465

Date: July 19, 2007

DLA Piper US LLP  
4365 Executive Drive, Suite 1100  
San Diego, California 92121-2133  
USPTO Customer Number 28213